C1852-1
8/2688

LIBRARY JOURNAL

SEPTEMBER 1, 1988

A CAHNERS-R.R. BOWKER PUBLICATION

The State of Library Literature
Preparation of New Librarians
Attitudes in Library Instruction

VOL. 113 No. 14 LIBRARY JOURNAL September 1, 1988

ISSN 0363-0277

The LJ *Annual Fall Announcement issue; photograph by Peter Neumann*

Letters 96
Calendar 106
Automation Roundup .. 123
People 124
Professional Reading ... 148
Checklist 149
Magazines 150
Buyers' Guide 152
AV Reviews & Distributors 154
Library Best Sellers ... 200
Classified 190
Index to Advertisers ... 199

LIBRARY JOURNAL is published by Bowker Magazine Group, Cahners Magazine Division, Terrence M. McDermott, President; Carroll V. Dowden, Group Vice President; Jerry D. Neth, Vice President/Publishing Operations; J. J. Walsh, Financial Vice President/Magazine Division; Thomas J. Dellamaria, Vice President/Production & Manufacturing. Bowker Magazine Group is also an affiliate of R. R. Bowker Co., Gordon Graham, Chairman of the Board; Ira Siegel, President. Copyright © 1988 by Reed Publishing, USA; Saul Goldweitz, Chairman; Ronald G. Segel, President/CEO; Robert L. Krakoff, Executive Vice President; William M. Platt, Sr. Vice President. Direct editorial and advertising correspondence to 249 West 17th Street, New York, NY 10011. Telephone: 212-463-6819. Subscription inquiries and changes of address should be directed to Library Journal, PO Box 1977, Marion, OH 43305-1977. Telephone: 1-800-669-1002 (in continental U.S. only). In Alaska, Hawaii, Canada and all other countries, telephone: 614-382-3322. Issued 20 times a year, twice a month, February through June and September through November, and once a month in January, July, August, and December. Second class postage paid at New York, N.Y., and additional mailing offices. Cahners Publishing Company, A Division of Reed Publishing USA ☐ Specialized Business Magazines for Building & Construction, Manufacturing, Foodservice & Lodging, Electronics & Computers, Interior Design, Printing, Publishing, Industrial Research & Technology, Health Care, and Entertainment. ☐ Specialized Consumer Magazines: *American Baby* and *Modern Bride*.

LIBRARY JOURNAL is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Library Literature*, *Library & Information Science Abstracts*, and *Magazine Index*. SUBSCRIPTIONS: USA: 1 year $69; 2 years, $117; 3 years, $164. Canada: 1 year $94, 2 years $160, 3 years $224. All other countries (surface delivery): 1 year $100. All other countries (air delivery): 1 year $125, 2 years $213, 3 years $299. (Remit in US funds only.) Single copy, $5.00. Spring & Fall Announcement Issues, $6.95. POSTMASTER: Please send address changes to *Library Journal*, P.O. Box 1977, Marion, OH 43305-1977.

FEATURES

Publication in Library Information Science: The State of the Literature 125
Statistics on getting published / by John Budd

The New Librarians: How Prepared Are They? ... 132
How much preparation is enough? / by Richard C. Pearson & T.D. Webb

Saint Jerome, the Patron Saint of Librarians 135
Scholar, collector, teacher, as role model / by Elizabeth Kaschins & Jane Kemp

Attitudes: The Forgotten Dimension in Library Instruction 137
How to deal with library-phobia / by Constance A. Mellon

Substance Abuse in Libraries: An Administrative Prescription 140
Rx for positive action / by John N. Olsgaard & Jane K. Olsgaard

COLUMNS

Online Databases: *An Interface for Self-Service* 142
Searching / by Carol Tenopir

Public Libraries Online: *Computer Databases as 1980s* .. 144
Reference Tools: Still a Long Way To Go / by Tina Roose

Research Reports / *by Mark E. Rorvig* 146

EDITORIAL

Karl Nyren, 1921-1988 94
In memoriam

LATE BULLETINS 107

NEWS 108

Mentor program for Hispanics at UCLA library school / Susan DiMattia named editor, Library Hotline / *New Mississippi law defines roles of library trustees and boards / Nader writes to Public Printer on the failure of Depository Program / Electronic distribution for government documents to be examined / FBI defends its "library awareness" before subcommittee hearing / COA seeks site visitors for library school accreditation / Univ. of Georgia football coach Dooley endows $100,000 library fund*

BOOK REVIEW 150

Philip Roth's *The Facts: A Novelist's Autobiography* p. 170 / Lance Morrow's *Fishing in the Tiber* p. 179 / Louise Erdrich's *Tracks* p. 182 / Joseph Heller's *Picture This* p. 182 / Anne Tyler's *Breathing Lessons* p. 184 / and more . . .

Getting published in library literature

Publication in Library & Information Science:

The State of the Literature

By John Budd

SEVERAL YEARS AGO Daniel O'Connor and Phyllis Van Orden began their paper, "Getting into Print," with the following statement: "Rampant criticism on the quality of library literature is so pervasive that we could be fearful that Katz's *Best of 1978* might contain only one or two articles."[1] It can be safely said that the members of the profession have not ceased the spectator sport of literature-bashing. It can also be safely said that such a phenomenon is not unique to library and information science.

The question of the quality of the literature seems to be dependent, to a considerable extent, on the motivational factors that drive people to write and publish. The factors at work may be based on need or desire. Robert Stueart investigated motivation and arrived at some elemental questions that can help define the climate to publish.

1. Do you want to publish? Is your idea something that has not been covered in the literature before?

2. Do you have to publish in order to advance professionally?

3. Are you anxious to relate the results of research performed in a scientific manner?

4. Do you have a real commitment to writing, and have you made the distinction between scholarly research and "how to do it" articles? There is a place for both in the literature.[2]

John Budd is Assistant Professor, Graduate Library School, University of Arizona, Tucson

The distinction Stueart speaks of in his last element is an important one. At present the literature reflects that some of its members are concerned primarily with practice, while others are seeking a scholarly base. The distinction presents the possibilities for argument about what the literature *should* be, but discussion must be preceded by the current state of publishing practice.

Publishing as communication

It is widely recognized that the ideal purpose of publishing is communication of ideas, research, opinion, and scholarship. A primary means of scholarly communication in virtually all disciplines (and certainly in library and information science) is the journal. The journal offers authors and readers some advantages over the monograph: the opportunity for dissemination of a larger number and broader scope of issues and questions; intensive study of very specific questions or aspects of large problems; and the timely publication of intended communication (though this last item may be a disputed point on both sides of the editorial fence).

How efficient is the network of journal literature in library and information science? Specifically, how well does this network serve prospective authors? O'Connor and Van Orden paid particular attention to these kinds of questions in their paper, seeking such information as acceptance rates of journals, publication delays, and means of reaching publication decisions. At the time they wrote their paper they recognized the pressure on individuals to publish, a factor that may be separate and apart from the desire to communicate with colleagues.[3] This pressure likely has not dissipated in the intervening years between their study and the present one. Publication is a criterion for advancement in many environments. It is hoped that these essentially external pressures do not adversely affect the quality of published works, that editors, in the course of exercising the "gatekeeper" function observed by Janice M. Beyer,[4] exert a strong controlling influence on quality.

The data

O'Connor and Van Orden presented data on 33 journals in library and information science.[5] The current study presents data on 48 journals. A total of 53 journals were surveyed, for a return rate of 90.6 percent. The criteria for inclusion in the study are essentially the same as those established by O'Connor and Van Orden: journals published in the United States and Canada; journals with a national audience; journals that accept or are open to consider unsolicited submissions; and journals that publish formal communication (that is, those that do not publish exclusively internal or agency news or brief informal exchanges).

These criteria exclude a number of publications. For instance, because of its policy of soliciting manuscripts, *Library Trends*, whose issues focus on specific themes, does not fall within the scope of this study. The journals represented by data presented here vary considerably in subscription size, subject matter, and means of support (association organs, institutional subsidies, etc.).

In order to ascertain the information that would be of interest and importance to authors in search of journals (and this information is the kind previously sought by O'Connor and

Van Orden), questionnaires were sent to the editors of the identified journals. Considerations regarding acceptance of submissions and the rate of unsolicited manuscripts published are presented in Table 1.

It is evident from the data in Table 1 that it is not a simple matter to calculate an overall acceptance rate for articles submitted to library and information science journals. A number of editors provide inexact information, usually in the form of range of submitted and accepted papers. Using these ranges, it appears that the acceptance rate for unsolicited papers is from 30.5 percent to 38.4 percent. A more precise estimate cannot be arrived at. This range is a bit more favorable (from the author's viewpoint) than the 22.7 percent rate observed by O'Connor and Van Orden.[6]

How many mss. are rejected?

The data in the present study show that approximately 60 to 70 percent of manuscripts are rejected. O'Connor and Van Orden expressed surprise at the high rejection rate of 77.3 percent when compared to other disciplines.[7] This rate may seem high in comparison to the sciences, but appears to be in line with the social sciences and humanities. A. Carolyn Miller and Sharon L. Serzan surveyed a number of journals in several disciplines and their data support the above contention. They noted lower rejection rates for the following fields: medical and health science (52 percent); engineering, allied sciences, and mathematics (47 percent); life sciences (41 percent); and earth, environmental, and physical sciences (35 percent).[8]

Some areas of the humanities and social sciences, on the other hand, were victim to higher rejection rates: history, area studies, political science, religion, and philosophy (62 percent); general and fine arts (65 percent); psychology and psychiatry (69 percent); education and communications (70 percent); professional studies (including library science, 74 percent); language, literature, and linguistics (74 percent); and business, economics, finance, management, and personnel (79 percent).[9] Other research has uncovered rejection rates of 88 percent for the humanities[10] and 85 percent for American history.[11] In light of these findings, the rejection for library and information science is neither surprising nor extraordinary.

What does the rejection rate indicated by available data signify for library and information science literature with respect to the literatures of other disciplines? Beyer examines publication decisions based on universalistic (consideration of merit and quality) or particularistic (personal preference, background of author, etc.) criteria.[12] She finds that in disciplines with high paradigm development,[13] such phenomena as low rejection rates reflect the universalistic judgment practices at work. While attempts are made in the social sciences to lessen the possible existence and impact of particularism (including anonymous refereeing and multiple referees), some particularistic elements persist, according to Beyer.[14]

Beyer's findings have implications for communication in many fields, including library and information science. Higher rejection rates, publication delays, longer articles (relative to the sciences) signify possible discouragement to research, impediments to communication. Beyer says, "It is difficult to see how such results can be beneficial to the development of a science."[15] Beyer's research should be examined further for its implications for the nature of literature in the social sciences and the relevance of comparison with the sciences.

The unsolicited piece

The last column of Table 1 reports the percentage of published articles that come from unsolicited manuscripts. As with the study conducted by O'Connor and Van Orden, the figures represent editors' estimates. They also represent considerable variation from journal to journal. O'Connor and Van Orden state that 68.1 percent of the articles published in 1975 (in reporting journals) came from unsolicited manuscripts.[16] Such a calculation from available data is difficult because of estimates. One notes that, in the past two years, "six unsolicited manuscripts have been received" and doubts that the number will increase. Other editors offer the following comments:

> [A couple of years ago] submissions were minimal. In the past two years this has changed dramatically with many good papers coming in unsolicited.

> Most of my papers are directly requested from people who have been recommended to [me] by colleagues or whom I know personally. Unsolicited papers are the exception, but they are always welcome.

> It seems to me that not enough publishable articles are received by editors. Perhaps librarians do not have time to write . . . . [W]e were running out of items to be published and, at times, we received manuscripts which had to be totally rewritten.

These comments lead to the supposition that, while the rates of unsolicited manuscripts published are not high for some jounals, editors may be more amenable to consideration of such submissions than figures suggest. This is not a universal phenomenon, which comes as no surprise. Further comments by editors point to the occurrences of unsolicited papers being the exception rather than the rule.

> Most of the material . . . is requested from qualified authors. Unsolicited mss. are considered only within the theme of the issue.

> Although many of the articles we receive are technically unsolicited, the people who write them tend to be turned into a "network" of librarians.

One of the responding editors makes some general comments about the fluctuating marketplace of the literature.

> We have . . . noted the field itself goes through phases of relatively high productivity and the reverse. I have yet to discover what dictates this pattern, but I suspect it relates to the following: number of faculty and higher library positions open, general availability of tenure track advancement, the professional agenda at any given time (whether or not there are major issues under debate), and the availability of funds that spark innovations, experiments, and new directions in the practice and service of libraries.

The above factors can certainly affect the number of manuscripts available for editors' consideration. Another factor, mentioned earlier, is the increase in the number of journals. Examination of some comparable data provides possible insights into the current state of the literature. Of 20 journals whose rates of published articles coming from unsolicited manuscripts can be compared between the earlier study and this one, 11 are lower, eight are higher, and one is the same. Of 17 journals whose acceptance rates can be compared, 14 are higher and three are lower.

These comparisons seem to indicate that the number of acceptable manuscripts has not kept pace with the rising number of journals. This is borne out by one more comparison: the total number of unsolicited manuscripts received by 15 journals in the O'Connor and Van Orden study is 1210; the total for the same 15 jour-

Table 1
Journal Data and Openness to Unsolicited Manuscripts

Title	No. of subscriptions	No. of unsolicited manuscripts submitted	No. of unsolicited manuscripts accepted	% of unsolicited manuscripts accepted	% of articles pub. annually which come from unsolicited manuscripts
American Archivist	4,000	—	—	—	—
American Libraries	47,000	150-200	15-20	8-13	50
Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian	450	—	—	—	—
Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science	4,500	12	4	33	8
Canadian Library Journal	5,500	35-70	30	43-86	85
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	c.1,000	25-30	20	67-80	50-60
Catholic Library World	3,000	c.30	c.10	33	10
Collection Building	1,500	50	20	40	40
Collection Management	c.1,000	8-10	most	—	15-20
College & Research Libraries	13,600	100	35	35	75
Community & Junior College Libraries	400	25-30	25	83-100	5-10
Government Publications Review	1,000	20	12	60	33
Horn Book	19,000	varies	c.10	—	varies
Information Processing & Management	1,071	85	25	29	15
Information Technology & Libraries	6,800	75-100	—	c.60	c.80
Journal of Academic Librarianship	2,500	100-150	20-30	13-30	98
Journal of Education for Library and Information Science	1,800	45-55	16-20	29-44	95
Journal of Library History	808	45	16	36	90
Journal of the American Society for the Information Science	4,000	75	50	67	80
Journal of Youth Services in Libraries	36,000	50-60	15-30	25-60	30-50
Law Library Journal	4,200	50	30	60	—
Legal Reference Services Quarterly	800	60-75	40-50	53-83	80
Library & Archival Security	c.1,000	6-10	3-5	30-83	10
Library & Information Science Research	475	30-40	12-16	30-53	c.75
Library Hi-Tech	10,200	100-150	8-12	5-12	15-25
Library Journal	27,000	—	—	—	—
Library Quarterly	c.3,900	c.54	c.13	24	100
Library Resources and Technical Services	c.9,500	41	13	32	41
Medical Library Association Bulletin	c.6,000	c.90	c.40	44	90
Medical Reference Services Quarterly	c.800	12	5	42	25
Microform Review	1,400-1,500	3	3	100	15
Notes	3,600	—	—	—	—
Online	5,500	c.60	c.20	33	c.20
Online Review	—	c.25	c.18	72	—
Public Libraries	c.6,000	c.40	c.8	20	20
Public Library Quarterly	10,000	30	20	67	75
Reference Librarian	1,500	2-3	1-2	33-100	1-2
RSR: Reference Services Review	—	10-20	10-15	50-100	45
Research Strategies	800	75	24	32	90
Resource Sharing & Information Networks	—	10-15	—	c.90	50
RQ	6,404	58	18	31	86
School Library Journal	42,000	300	30	10	10
School Library Media Quarterly	7,000	35	12-15	38-43	80
Science & Technology Libraries	c.800	5-10	4-5	40-100	15
Serials Librarian	c.2,000	6-10	3-5	30-83	10
Special Libraries	12,500	25	12-13	48-52	15
Technical Services Quarterly	700	15-20	10-15	50-100	50
Voice of Youth Advocates	3,300	—	12-15	—	10

nals in the present study is 1,003. This may prove to be beneficial to authors, but its implications for communication are yet to be seen.

Manuscript review

Since library and information science as a discipline exhibits many of the outward traits of the social sciences, particularly in the area of rejection rate, it should be expected that unsolicited manuscripts undergo a formal review process before a publication decision is made. The question remains as to what types of review are submissions put through. As is noted above, Beyer maintains that a refereeing process is an attempt at applying univeralistic judgment to the selection of publishable papers. O'Connor and Van Orden agree, with an added caveat: "Although refereeing does not guarantee the production of quality manuscripts, is does inject independence and impartiality into the selection process."[17]

How many journals use referees (or readers other than the editor) in determining which papers to publish? Table 2 presents the mechanisms of evaluation used by library and information science journals and the number of readers to whom each manuscript is sent.

If peer review is interpreted with sufficient looseness to include editorial staffs and editorial boards, then the majority of library and information science journals can be seen to employ a peer review process. The problem exists of defining that particular form of peer review—refereeing.

Miller and Serzan provide the strictest and most detailed assessment of what constitutes a refereed journal.[18] Ruth Fraley and Barbara Via avoid the issue by simply asking editors if their journals are refereed.[19] The formal use of referees who are not members of staffs or boards has risen considerably in the last decade. O'Connor and Van Orden observed that, "Though there appears to be movement towards refereeing, only six journals employed a full refereeing system."[20] The movement has certainly accelerated; Table 2 illustrates that 20 journals are relying on referees in the evaluative process. (Fifteen use double-blind refereeing.)

It could be that the impetus for such movement has been more external than internal, with university-wide standards affecting those professional staff members with faculty or academic status. Whatever the cause, the use of referees is generally acknowledged to be the most effective system in use. As Stuart Glogoff states, "Practicing a double-blind refereeing process where the author's name is not revealed to the referee as well as the referee remaining anonymous to the author seems the most objective method."[21]

If peer review is considered to be a "good thing," then what characterizes it?; how does it work? John C. Bailar and Kay Patterson observe that:

> Four paradigms seem to capture much current opinion about peer review of scientific works submitted for journal publication: the sieve (peer review screens worthy from unworthy submissions); the switch (a persistent author can eventually get anything published, but peer review determines where); the smithy (papers are pounded into new and better shapes between the hammer of peer review and the anvil of editorial standards); and the shot in the dark (peer review is essentially unpredictable and unreproducible and hence, in effect, random).[22]

Bailar and Patterson conclude that peer review seems to work well and that no feasible alternative presents itself.

One possible drawback to peer review, and specifically to refereeing, is perceived by Michael D. Gordon. Gordon posits that referees can form something of a network that may overlap with a larger network of authors. The possibility exists for less rigor when the sets formed by the networks intersect because of common ground with regard to intellectual bases and/or similarity of institutional environment. Because of this,

> It can therefore be argued that biases systematically operate within refereeing systems in such a way as to give advantage to those elements of a research community which supply the largest proportion of the referees used by the editors of its journals. The papers of such authors may on occasion be less demandingly evaluated than those of authors outside the group.[23]

The implications of this (if it is an occurring phenomenon) are that newness of ideas, innovation of methodology, and divergence of interpretation may be stifled.

Criteria for publication

Assuming an efficient system of conscientious and objective referees, what criteria are used in making decisions to recommend publication? Glogoff surveyed referees for journals in library and information science and offered them six choices of criteria for evaluation. The referees selected the criteria in the following order: validity of claims, originality, clarity, reader appeal, importance of subject to the referee, and manuscript secrecy referee from author.[24]

Robert K. Coe and Irwin Weinstock surveyed managing editors and reviewers (referees) of business journals and found the following five reasons for rejection of manuscripts mentioned most frequently by both groups (though not in the same rank order): does not add significantly to the current body of knowledge, too superficial, inappropriate subject matter, poorly written, and inadequate research.[25] If a synthesis of these findings could be expressed as advice to authors, the conclusion might be to select a significant question, be careful to adopt an appropriate method of study, execute the study thoroughly, and write with clarity.

It may be a tacit assumption among authors and those not involved with the inner workings of the editorial process that referees are working from carefully devised and explicitly stated criteria for evaluation. O'Connor and Van Orden report that "several" editors sent evaluation forms.[26] In the present study only one editor sent an evaluation form. It should be noted that editors were not requested to supply such forms. Glogoff asked referees if some form or other aid was used: 55 responded yes and 55, no.[27] In the study conducted by Miller and Serzan it was found that "Only one-third (33 percent) of the journals . . . use some type of evaluation criteria form, and only ten percent publish it regularly to aid prospective authors."[28] It could be in editors' interests to devise formal sets of evaluation criteria (if they do not already exist) and to publish these criteria in one issue each year. In general, the suggestions of O'Connor and Van Orden are as valid today as they were a decade ago and deserve reiteration:

> 1) Journals should regularly publish specific statements on their purpose, scope, and audience; 2) journals should publish the criteria used to evaluate manuscripts; and 3) journals should adopt a double-blind refereeing system.[29]

It is evident from Table 2 that a number of means of evaluation are at work in library and information science journals. In this respect library and information science is probably no different from most fields, especially professional fields. If a particular journal's intention is to be a forum for scholarly communication, then it should subscribe to agreed-upon standards for evaluation of manu-

scripts. Stephen Juhasz offers some recommendations for consideration, among which are multiple referees for each paper, detailed guidelines for communicating with editors (distributed to referees), a four-week period for referee review manuscripts, and indication by the journal of the use of referees in evaluation.[30] Greater standardization of practice could lead to a more efficient system of communication from the standpoint of both authors and editors.

How long does the process take?

One of Juhasz's recommendations intimates an area of concern with the communication process—publication delays. While there is general agreement that refereeing leads to the most objective means of evaluating papers for publication, it can, when there is a lack of diligence on the parts of referees or editors, exacerbate delays. As Eugene Garfield states,

> Real or perceived, delays in publication resulting from refereeing may be the most prevalent concern among scientists, who may have job security, promotion, or the need to establish priority for a discovery hanging in the balance.[31]

This concern is not limited to scientists; it is in the personal interest of anyone whose professional advancement depends on such criteria as publication to have papers published as quickly as possible. From the standpoint of the discipline, the timely dissemination of research and information can only serve to facilitate progress on all fronts.

The question of publication delays of library and information science journals is addressed in Table 3. The times from receipt of manuscripts to the arrival at publication decisions and the times from decisions to actual publication are reported in weeks.

As is true of the other factors examined in this study, there is considerable variation in practice from journal to journal (and even, at times, within the workings of individual journals). Though calculation of a general trend is difficult, it appears that the average time from submission to decision is approximately nine to ten weeks. The average time from decision to publication is approximately 26 weeks. Based on these calculations, an author of a paper accepted for publication can expect to see it in print about nine months after submitting it to a journal. While this seems to be a considerable delay, it

Table 2
Evaluation Process

Selection Process	No. of Readers
1. *Editor alone decides*	
Catholic Library World	1
Journal of Youth Services in Libraries	1
Law Library Journal	1
Medical Reference Services Quarterly[1]	1
Microform Review	1
Public Libraries	1
Public Library Quarterly	1
Voice of Youth Advocates	1
2. *Editor decides with assistance from staff*	
American Archivist	4
American Libraries	4-6
Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science	2
Horn Book	2
Legal Reference Services Quarterly	2-4
Notes	—
School Library Journal	3
3. *Editor and editorial board decide*	
Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian	2-3
Canadian Library Journal	2
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly[2]	2-3
Government Publication Reviews[2]	3-6
Journal of Education for Library and Information Science	3-4
Technical Services Quarterly	1-3
4. *Editorial board decides*	
Research Strategies	5-6
5. *Referees who know author's name decide*	
Collection Building	2-4
Information Processing & Management	2
Journal of the American Society for Information Science	2
Medical Library Association Bulletin[3]	4
Online Review	3
6. *Referees who do not know author's name decide*	
Collection Management[4]	2-4
College & Research Libraries[4]	3
Information Technology and Libraries	1-2
Journal of Academic Librarianship	3
Journal of Library History	4-5
Library and Archival Security	2-4
Library & Information Science Research	3
Library Quarterly[4]	2-4
Library Resources and Technical Services[4]	1-3
Resource Sharing & Information Networks	2
RQ	3
School Library Media Quarterly	3
Science and Technology Libraries[3]	2
Serials Librarian[4]	2-4
Special Libraries	2
7. *Combination*	
Online	2
The Reference Librarian	10-15
RSR: Reference Services Review	2-3

1. Sometimes uses editorial board and referees who do not know author's name
2. Manuscript is reviewed by readers who are usually, but not always, members of the editorial board
3. Editor makes the final decision
4. Editor assumes ultimate responsibility for decision

Table 3
Publication Delays

Title	Time from receipt of manuscript to pub. decision (in wks.)	Time from pub. decision to publication (in wks.)	Is criticism of rejected manuscripts offered?
American Archivist	—	—	—
American Libraries	6-8	4-12	Sometimes
Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian	15	26-32	Yes
Bulletin of American Society for Information Science	3	6	No
Canadian Library Journal	26	6	Not to great extent
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	10-15	30-40	Yes
Catholic Library World	2	c.26	Yes
Collection Building	6	10-30	Yes
Collection Management	5-8	c.20	Yes
College & Research Libraries	6-8	8-16	Yes
Community & Junior College Libraries	varies	12+	Yes
Government Publications Review	6-8	c.52	Extensive
Horn Book	4	6-52	Sometimes suggests other publications
Information Processing and Management	3	12	Yes
Information Technology and Libraries	6	8-12	Yes
Journal of Academic Librarianship	6-8	12-52	Yes
Journal of Education for Library and Information Science	8-10	c.24	Yes
Journal of Library History	12-16	52+	Yes
Journal of the American Society for Information Science	c.12	c.65	Yes
Journal of Youth Services in Libraries	.5-4	1-16	Some
Law Library Journal	6-8	26-52	Yes
Legal Reference Services Quarterly	8-12	26	Sometimes
Library and Archival Security	5-6	c.20	Yes
Library & Information Science Research	12	12-26	Yes
Library Hi-Tech	2-12	12-64	As time permits
Library Journal	c.4	8-24	When appropriate
Library Quarterly	2+	26-52	Yes—varies
Library Resources and Technical Services	1-10	varies	Not in depth
Medical Library Association Bulletin	8-10	c.4-8	Yes
Medical Reference Services Quarterly	6	38	Yes
Microform Review	1 day	26-52	If needed
Notes	1-8	4-12 + 26 lead time	Sometimes
Online	c.4	30	Upon request
Online Review	12	8	Yes
Public Libraries	1-26	10-52	Not usually
Public Library Quarterly	c.4	c.22	No
The Reference Library	1.5	16-32	Yes
RSR: Reference Services Review	52-104	52-78	Yes
Research Strategies	varies	8	Yes
Resource Sharing & Information Networks	10-15	26-78	Yes
RQ	19	37	Yes
School Library Journal	16-26	usually 12	No
School Library Media Quarterly	6-8	12-26	No
Science and Technology Libraries	2-3	26-38	Yes
Serials Librarian	5-6	c.20	Yes
Special Libraries	16-20	16-20	On request
Technical Services Quarterly	c.4-8	c.20-30	Always
Voice of Youth Advocates	3-6	36-52	Sometimes

should be noted that the time required for the same process in the humanities is about 15 months.[32]

Causes for delays can be several. As is mentioned above, the refereeing process, when not operating smoothly, can take time. Communication is not facilitated when a manuscript languishes on a referee's desk. A backlog of accepted manuscripts can delay publication, especially in journals published quarterly or semi-annually. Another factor causing delays is copyediting. If a manuscript has to be returned to an author for revision another layer is added to the process.

Some editors indicate that revision is not an uncommon occurrence. One states, "The quality of submissions these days is generally high, but copyediting, even so, is necessary." The need for revision or editing can be extensive, as is evidenced by the following comment: "Few manuscripts are accepted without at least *some* revision." Another is even stronger in an assessment of the need for revision: "99 percent of all articles published are revised prior to acceptance. In two years we've only published *one* unrevised piece. Some require extensive revision—so the elapsed time from submission to acceptance is a two-stage process, usually." When considering the above factors, along with the time required to print and distribute the journal, a delay of nine months may not be so onerous as it first appears.

The well-prepared get published

The data presented here illustrate that it is not a foregone conclusion that a manuscript submitted to a journal will be accepted for publication. Because of this there exists, and probably will exist for some time, competition for space in the pages of journals. This space likely will go to the well-prepared. Getting published in journals is not a game, but it sometimes emulates one. Journals or editors have rules that participants are expected to follow. Some journals make their rules known; some do not. Most include instructions to authors regarding manuscript preparation and bibliographic form, but very few share their evaluation criteria if, indeed, they have formally developed criteria.

Who is successful at getting into print? Paula D. Watson examined authorship of articles in 11 major journals for the period 1979 through 1983 and found that, on average, 65 percent of the articles were written by academic librarians and library school faculty and students.[33] Watson identifies the 20 most productive "academic" libraries (one of which is the Library of Congress). Productivity is measured by the number of publications written by persons affiliated with the libraries.[34]

Of the 19 *academic* libraries, 18 are members of the Association of Research Libraries. The advantage that those working at such institutions enjoy may or may not be based on the institution's reputation. More like something which is at once more subtle and more basic may be at work, as Felix M. Berardo observes:

> While it is sometimes found that higher ranked academicians from more prestigious institutions are more successful in their publication endeavors, the explanation more likely rests, not in the operation of particularistic factors, but in the social structure of academia itself: Larger universities have more money and resources. Consequently, they attract faculty from other large universities who are trained in sophisticated research methodologies.[35]

As a corollary to Berardo's statement, the larger universities also have greater resources and better funding for research and may have higher expectations for the people affiliated with them. Because of these phenomena, in library and information science, as in most disciplines, individuals in less advantageous situations must narrow the gap through initiative and perseverance.

O'Connor and Van Orden end their paper on a positive note with their suggestions for reform. Their suggestions should be implemented as quickly as possible. Also, the editors of journals might gather as colleagues to discuss such matters as standards for evaluation of manuscripts. The scene appears to have brightened somewhat in the last decade. More journals are employing referees to help make publication decisions. One assist to authors is evident in Table 3—most journals offer at least some criticism of rejected manuscripts. If it is agreed that library and information science is a dynamic profession, then there should be great hope for communication in the field and for the journals that foster and present the communication.

References

1. O'Connor, Daniel & Phyllis Van Orden, "Getting into Print," *College & Research Libraries*, Sept. 1978, p. 389.
2. Stueart, Robert D., "Writing the Journal Article," *College & Research Libraries*, Mar. 1976, p. 154.
3. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 389-390.
4. Beyer, Janice M., "Editorial Policies and Practices Among Leading Journals in Four Scientific Fields," *Sociological Quarterly*, Winter 1978, p. 68.
5. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 389-396.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 391.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Miller, A. Carolyn & Sharon L. Serzan, "Criteria for Identifying a Refereed Journal," *Journal of Higher Education*, Nov./Dec. 1984, p. 683.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Budd, John, "Humanities Journals in 1979," *Scholarly Publishing*, Jan. 1981, p. 172.
11. Zink, Steven D., "Journal Publishing in the Field of U.S. History," *Scholarly Publishing*, Jul. 1980, p. 353.
12. Beyer, p. 68-88.
13. Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1970.
14. Beyer, p. 68-88.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
16. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 391.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 393.
18. Miller & Serzan, p. 673-699.
19. Fraley, Ruth & Barbara Via, "Survey of Library & Information Science Journal Publishers," in Sellen, Betty-Carol, ed. *Librarian/Author*. Neal-Schuman, 1985, p. 117-214.
20. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 393.
21. Glogoff, Stuart, "Reviewing the Gatekeepers: A Survey of Referees of Library Journals," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, accepted for publication.
22. Bailar, John C., III & Kay Patterson, "Journal Peer Review: The Need for a Research Agenda," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Mar. 7, 1985, p. 654.
23. Gordon, Michael D., "The Role of Referees in Scientific Communication," in Hartley, James, ed. *The Psychology of Written Communication*. Kogan Page, 1980, p. 275.
24. Glogoff.
25. Coe, Robert K. & Irwin Weinstock, "Publication Policies of Major Business Journals," *Southern Journal of Business*, Jan. 1968, p. 7.
26. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 395.
27. Glogoff.
28. Miller & Serzan, p. 682.
29. O'Connor & Van Orden, p. 396.
30. Juhasz, Stephen, "Acceptance and Rejection of Manuscripts," *IEEE Transactions of Professional Communication*, Sept. 1975, p. 183.
31. Garfield, Eugene, "Refereeing and Peer Review." Pt. 1: "Opinion and Conjecture on the Effectiveness of Refereeing," *Current Contents*, Aug. 4, 1986, p. 7.
32. Budd, p. 172.
33. Watson, Paula D., "Production of Scholarly Articles by Academic Librarians and Library School Faculty," *College & Research Libraries*, Jul. 1985, p. 336.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 338.
35. Berardo, Felix M., "The Publication Process: An Editor's Perspective," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Nov. 1981, p. 772.